



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,835	08/05/2004	Adam D. Dirstine	977.066US1	6749
21186 7590 11/26/2010 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER HUYNH, THU V				
ART UNIT 2178		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 11/26/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com
request@slwip.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/710,835

Applicant(s)

DIRSTINE, ADAM D.

Examiner

THU V. HUYNH

Art Unit

2178

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 17, 19-26 and 31-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-17, 19-26, 31-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on 9/2/2010, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The new ground of rejection is set forth below. A supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:
To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this office action is final): or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 27 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the different between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

2. This action is responsive to communications: appeal brief filed on 9/2/2010 to application filed on 08/05/04.
3. Claims 16-17, 19-26, 31-38 are pending claims in this case. Claims 16 and 31 are dependent claims.
4. All rejections in the previous office action not set forth below have been withdrawn as necessitated by consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding dependent claims 36-38 which is dependent on claims 16, 31 and 37 respectively, these claims recite the limitation “associate at least one XML tag with **the compressed valid XML document**” (claims 36-37) and “receive **the compressed valid XML document**” (claim 38) render the claims are vague and indefinite, since it is not clear what “compressed valid XML document” is referred to, such as the compressed valid XML document that is converted from the first XML document of claims 36 and 37; or from the XML document of the independent claims 16 and 31.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. **Claims 16-20, 23-25, 31, 36-38 are provisionally rejected on the ground of**

nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 15 of copending Application No. 11980901 in view of Cseri et al., US 2003/0046317 A1, filed 04/19/01.

Regarding claims 16-20, 23-25, 31, 36-38 of the instant application, claims 1-6, 15 teaches all the limitations of claims 16-20, 31-32, 36-38, except the limitations of a communication network; at least one processor; at least first and second network devices to communicates over the network; at least one processor; a network interface configured to communicate with the at least one processor and a network; and an XML document processing module, including a compression module; the network interface includes a web interface; the network interface is a wireless network; the network device is included in a cell phone.

Cseri teaches a communication network (Reeves, fig.1, col.3, lines 20-29); at least one processor (Cseri, fig.1; [0020]; personal and server computers); at least first and second network devices to communicates over the network (Reeves, fig.1, col.3, lines 20-29), a network interface configured to communicate with the at least one processor and a network (Cseri, fig.1, [0020]; connecting to the Internet network); an XML document processing module, including a compression module (Cseri, [0014], [0020], [0063], [0092]); the network interface includes a web interface (Cseri, [0020]-[0021]; in order to transmit, access XML web document in the Internet, the network interface must includes a web interface); the network interface is a wireless network (Cseri, [0021]); the network device is included in a cell phone (Cseri, [0020], [0115], hand-held devices, mobile phones).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Cseri's teaching into the '901's teaching, since the combination would have performing the '901 method by a system or network device.

9. Claims 21, 32 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 15 of copending Application No. 11980901 in view of Cseri, and further in view of Gordy et al., US 20050129033, filed 12/13/2003

Regarding claims 21 and 32 of the instant application, the '901 does not teach the network device is an embedded device server operable to manage a remote device using XML documents.

Gordy teaches embedded device server can directly communicate with client and serial communication (Gordy, [0079]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Gordy's teaching into the '901's teaching to include an embedded device service server, since the combination would have allowed any devices to directly accessible in the network that including serial communication to performing the '901's methods.

10. Claims 22, 34 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 15 of copending Application No. 11980901 in view of Cseri, and further in view of Ma et al., US 2005/0063575 A1, filed 09/22/03.

Regarding claims 22 and 34 of the instant application, the '901 does not teach the network interface includes a serial port.

Ma teaches network interface includes a serial port (Ma, [0074]; a serial communication network).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Ma's teaching and the '901's teaching to include a serial port, since the combination would have connected systems using many types of communication network to performing the '901's methods.

11. Claims 22, 34 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 15 of copending Application No. 11980901 in view of Cseri, and further in view Hsu et al., US 2004/0205158, filed 02/24/03.

Regarding claim 26 of the instant application, the '901 does not teach the network is wireless local area network (WLAN) and the network device is included in a WLAN computer card. Cseri teaches the network is a wireless local area network (WLAN) (Cseri, [0019], [0020], network LAN and is wired or wireless). However, Cseri does not explicitly disclose the network device is included in a WLAN computer card.

Hsu teaches network device is included in a WLAN computer card (Hsu, [0093], laptop includes WLAN card).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hsu's teaching into the '901's teaching to include WLAN computer card, since the combination would have connected systems using many type of communication network to performing the '901's methods.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 16, 20, 23-25, 31, 33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri et al., US 2003/0046317 A1, filed 04/19/01, in view of Reeves, US 7178163, filed 11/12/2002, and Debettencourt et al., US 20050060372, filed 8/27/2003.**

Regarding independent claim 16, Cseri teaches a network device comprises:

- at least one processor (Cseri, fig.1; [0020]; personal and server computers);
- a network interface configured to communicate with the at least one processor and a network (Cseri, fig.1, [0020]; connecting to the Internet network); and

- an XML document processing module, including a compression module configured to compress an XML document into a compressed binary stream, wherein the compressing an XML document into a compressed binary stream includes compressing redundant text stream in the XML (Cseri, [0014], [0020], [0063], [0092]; compressing XML document by tokenizing the XML document to produce XML binary formatted document wherein the tokenizing includes tokenizing redundant XML tags, such as <a> or).

Cseri does not teach convert the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and formatting the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document, including replacing any invalid XML characters with standard XML replacement text.

Reeves teaches a network device comprising:

- at least one processor (Reeves, fig.1, col.3, lines 20-29; personal and server computes);
- a network interface configured to communicate with the at least one processor and a network (Reeves, fig.2; col.3, lines 31-42; col.5, lines 21-41; connecting client, server to the Internet network);
- a document processing module configured to convert a document into a binary stream (Reeves, fig.3; serializing the information into binary data);
- converting a binary stream into ASCII text encoded from the binary stream (Reeves, fig.3, UUEncode, col.8, lines 38-43; claim 3, "converting the binary data to ASCII data"); and

- formatting the ASCII text so as to form an XML (Reeves, coding at the end of col.7 and col.8; embedding the ASCII text into an XML message/envelope for transmitting to a client).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Reeves's teaching and Cseri's teaching to convert Cseri's compressed binary stream to compressed ASCII text and format the compressed ASCII text to form a compress XML message/document, since the combination would have transformed the binary into text stream appropriate for transmission a part of an XML message over the HTTP protocol, as well as using the such XML message as Reeves disclosed in col.8, lines 38- 43 and col.9, lines 1-33.

Debettencourt teaches replacing invalid XML characters with standard XML text according to XML encoding definition (Debettencourt, [0233]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Petersen's teaching and Cseri's teaching to replace invalid XML character with standard XML text, since the replacement would have provided an XML message/document in a valid format.

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri does not teaches XML document processing module includes a decompression module to decompress compressed valid XML document.

Reeves teaches a document processor decompresses an XML document (Reeves, fig.5; item 408; col.9, lines 48-61; decompressing the XML message to obtain the document for evaluating).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Reeves' teaching and Cseri's XML document processing module to decompress the compressed valid XML message, since the combination would have evaluated the document or XML document that is compressed into binary.

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri teaches the network interface includes a web interface (Cseri, [0020]-[0021]; in order to transmit, access XML web document in the Internet, the network interface must includes a web interface).

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri teaches the network interface is a wireless network (Cseri, [0021]).

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Cseri teaches the network device is included in a cell phone (Cseri, [0020], [0115], hand-held devices, mobile phones).

Regarding independent claim 31, Cseri teaches the steps of:

- a communication network (Cseri, [0020], [0021]; communication network for connecting systems to the Internet network);

- at least first and second network devices to communicate over the network (Cseri, [0020], [0021]; the network device comprises personal computer, hand-held devices, server computers, main frames, etc., wherein each network device includes:
 - o at least one processor (Cseri, [0020]);
 - o a network interface to communicate with the at least one processor (Cseri, figure 1, [0020], [0021]).
 - o an XML document processing module, wherein the XML document processing module includes:
 - compress an XML document into a compressed binary stream by compressing redundant text stream in the XML document (Cseri, [0014], [0020], [0063], [0092]; compressing XML document by tokenizing the XML document to produce XML binary formatted document wherein the tokenizing includes tokenizing redundant XML tags, such as <a> or);

However, Cseri does not disclose convert the compressed binary steam into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and format the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document for transfer over the network; and a decompression module configured to decompress a compressed valid XML document received over the network.

Reeves teaches system comprising:

- a communication network (Reeves, fig.1, col.3, lines 20-29)

- at least first and second network devices to communicates over the network (Reeves, fig.1, col.3, lines 20-29), wherein each network device includes:
- at least one processor (Reeves, fig.1, col.3, lines 20-29; personal and server computes);
- a network interface configured to communicate with the at least one processor and a network (Reeves, fig.2; col.3, lines 31-42; col.5, lines 21-41; connecting client, server to the Internet network);
- a document processing module configured to convert a document into a compress binary steam (Reeves, fig.3; serializing information/document into binary data);
- converting a binary stream into ASCII text encoded from the binary stream (Reeves, fig.3, UUEncode, col.8, lines 38-43; claim 3, “converting the binary data to ASCII data”);
- formatting the ASCII text so as to form an XML (Reeves, coding at the end of col.7 and col.8; embedding the ASCII text into an XML message/envelope for transmitting to a client); and
- decompressing XML document (Reeves, fig.5; item 408; col.9, lines 48-61; decompressing the XML message to obtain the document for evaluating).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Reeves’s teaching and Cseri’s teaching to convert Cseri’s compressed binary stream to compressed ASCII text and format the compressed ASCII text to form a compress XML message/document, since the combination would have transformed the

binary into text stream appropriate for transmission a part of an XML message over the HTTP protocol, as well as evaluated the document or XML document.

Debettencourt teaches replacing invalid XML characters with standard XML text according to XML encoding definition (Debettencourt, [0233]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Petersen's teaching and Cseri's teaching to replace invalid XML character with standard XML text, since the replacement would have provided an XML message/document in a valid format.

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent on claim 31, the combination of Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt teaches the first network device is operable to transfer to a status message as a compressed valid XML document to the second network device (Cseri, [0037], XML document is a configuration file; Reeves, col.2, lines 14-19; col.7, lines 17-22; document is user/application status). The rationale is incorporated herein.

Regarding claim 35, which is dependent on claim 31, Cseri teaches the network is a wireless communication network (Cseri, [0021]).

14. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Girardot et al., US 2003/0023628 A1, filed 04/09/01.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri does not explicitly disclose the XML document processing module is configured to compress the XML document into the compressed binary stream using a deflate compression algorithm.

Girardot teaches deflate compression is popular used to compress a document (Girardot, [0009]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Girardot's teaching into Reeves and Cseri's teaching to compress the XML document using deflate compression algorithm, since the deflate compression is popular one.

15. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Tycksen, Jr., et al., US 6,189,097 B1, filed 03/24/97.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, Cseri does not teach wherein the binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm includes using base-64 encoding algorithm.

Tycksen teaches the binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm includes using base-64 encoding algorithm (Tycksen, col.9, lines 7-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tycksen's teaching into Reeves and Cseri's teaching to include a base-64 encoding algorithm, since the combination allowed converted the XML binary data in different encoded formats.

16. Claims 21-22, 32, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt as applied to claims 16 and 31 above, and further in view of Gordy et al., US 20050129033, filed 12/13/2003

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri teaches the network device is a device server operable to manage a remote device using XML documents (Cseri, fig.1; [0020]; servers and/or clients are connected in the network and [0037], XML document is a configuration file; Reeves, col.5, lines 19-33; servers or/and clients are connected in the network and col.2, lines 14-19; col.7, lines 17-22; document is user/application status).

However, Cseri and Reeves does not teaches embedded device server.

Gordy teaches embedded device server can directly communicate with client and serial communication (Gordy, [0079]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Gordy's teaching into Reeves and Cseri's teaching to include an embedded device service server, since the combination would have allowed any devices to directly accessible in the network that including serial communication.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri does not explicitly disclose the network interface includes a serial port.

Gordy teaches embedded device server can directly communicate with client and serial communication (Gordy, [0079]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Gordy's teaching and Cseri's teaching to include a serial

port, since the combination would have connected systems using many types of communication network.

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent on claim 31, the combination of Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt teaches the first network device operable to receive a device configuration file as a compressed valid XML document and decompress the document (Cseri, [0037], XML document is a configuration file). The rationale is incorporated herein.

However, Cseri does not teach the first network device is an embedded device server.

Gordy teaches embedded device server can directly communicate with client and serial communication (Gordy, [0079]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Gordy's teaching into Reeves and Cseri's teaching to include a serial port, since the combination would have allowed any devices to directly accessible in the network that including serial communication.

Regarding claim 34, which is dependent on claim 31, Sceri teaches the network is wired or wireless satellite network (Sceri, [0019], [0020]). However, Sceri teaches does not explicitly disclose the network is a serial communication network.

Ma teaches network is a serial communication network (Ma, [0074]; serial network).

Gordy teaches embedded device server can directly communicate with client and serial communication (Gordy, [0079]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Gordy's teaching into Reeves and Cseri's teaching to include a serial wireless network, since the combination would have allowed any devices to directly accessible in the network that including serial communication.

17. Claims 22, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sceri, Reeves and Debettencourt as applied to claims 16 above, and further in view of Ma et al., US 2005/0063575 A1, filed 09/22/03.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent on claim 16, Sceri does not explicitly disclose the network interface includes a serial port.

Ma teaches network interface includes a serial port (Ma, [0074]; a serial communication network).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Ma's teaching and Sceri's teaching to include a serial port, since the combination would have connected systems using many types of communication network.

Regarding claim 34, which is dependent on claim 31, Sceri teaches the network is wired or wireless satellite network (Sceri, [0019], [0020]). However, Sceri teaches does not explicitly disclose the network is a serial communication network.

Ma teaches network is a serial communication network (Ma, [0074]; serial network).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Ma's teaching and Sseri's teaching to include a serial wireless network, since the combination would have connect system using many type of communication network.

18. Claim 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sceri, Reeves and Debettencourt as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hsu et al., US 2004/0205158, filed 02/24/03.

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 16, Sceri teaches the network is a wireless local area network (WLAN) (Sceri, [0019], [0020], network LAN and is wired or wireless). However, Sceri does not explicitly disclose the network device is included in a WLAN computer card.

Hsu teaches network device is included in a WLAN computer card (Hsu, [0093], laptop includes WLAN card).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hsu's teaching into Sceri's teaching to include WLAN computer card, since the combination would have connected systems using many type of communication network.

19. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Krasinski et al., US 6850948 A1, filed 10/30/2000.

Regarding claims 36-37, which are dependent on claims 16 and 31 respectively, however, Reeves teaches associating at least on XML tag with the compressed valid XML document (Reeves, xml code at the end of col.7-8). The rationale is incorporated herein. However, Reeves does not teach wherein the XML tag identifies the document as a compressed XML document.

Krasinski teaches associating at least on XML tag with the compressed valid XML document, wherein the XML tag identifies the document as a compressed XML document (Krasinski, fig.2, claim 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Krasinski's teaching into Reeves and Cseri's teaching to insert XML tag with compressed valid the XML document, since the combination would have identified the document as well as how or what algorithm is used to compress the document.

Regarding claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, refer to claim 1, the combination of Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt teaches receive the compressed valid XML document containing compressed text (Reeves, fig.5, xml code at the end of col.7 and 9; col.9, lines 48-67). The rationale is incorporated herein.

Reeves teaches reconverting the compressed text into binary stream and decompress the binary stream to obtain the document (Reeves, fig.5, col.9, lines 48-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Reeves' teaching into Cseri's teaching to convert the

compressed ASCII text into binary stream and decompress the binary stream to obtain the XML document, since the combination would have validated the document or XML document.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-17, 19-26, 31-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants mainly argue with respect to claim 16 and 31 that the combination of Cseri, Eller and Petersen does not teach converting a compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream.

However, the combination of Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt teaches such limitations as explained in the rejection above.

Applicants mainly argue that the combination of Cseri, Eller and Petersen does not teach decompressing the compressed valid XML document.

However, the combination of Cseri, Reeves and Debettencourt teaches such limitations as explained in the rejection above.

Applicants argue with respect to claims 21 and 32 that Cseri does not teach an embedded device server to receive a device configuration file.

However, the combination of Cseri, Reeves, Debettencourt and Gordy teaches such limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention.

Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thu Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
November 20, 2010

